

REMARKS

In response to the Office Action mailed January 8, 2008, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration. To further the prosecution of this Application, Applicant submits the following remarks, has canceled claims, and has added new claims. The claims as now presented are believed to be in allowable condition.

Claims 1-37 were pending in this Application. By this Amendment, claims 5, 13, 18, 23, and 31 have been canceled. Applicant expressly reserves the right to prosecute at least some of the canceled claims and similar claims in one or more related Applications. Claims 38-41 have been added. Accordingly, claims 1-4, 6-12, 14-17, 19-22, 24-30, and 32-41 are now pending in this Application. Claims 1, 11, 19, 29, 36, and 37 are independent claims.

Rejections under §102 and §103

Claims 18, 29-30, and 32-34 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,922,049 (Radia, et al.). Claims 1-7, 19-25, 31, and 35-37 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2003/0120818 (Ho). Claims 8-10 and 26-28 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of Ho, in further view of U.S. Patent Publication No. 2002/0059429 (Carpenter, et al.). Claims 11-12 and 14-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of Carpenter. Claims 13 and 17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Radia in view of Carpenter, in further view of Ho.

Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and requests reconsideration. The claims are in allowable condition.

Radia teaches a method for learning routes by analyzing DHCP packets (ABSTRACT). If a router 106 receives a DHCP message 300 sent by a DHCP server 110 towards a client system 102, then router process 214 (executing on the router 106) examines options field 308 of the DHCP message 300 to determine if it is a DHCPACK message (step 404) (col. 5, lines 6-37). If it is a DHCPACK message, then router process 214 extracts the IP address from the yiaddr field 304 of the message 300 (step 406) (col. 5, lines 38-43). Router process 214 then updates routing table 216 to indicate that packets directed towards the extracted IP address should be forwarded to the client system 102, further marking the entry to indicate that it is DHCP assigned (step 410) (col. 5, lines 44-51). The marking indicates that the route should not be altered unless another DHCPACK message reassigning the IP address is received (col. 5, lines 52-54).

Claims 29-35

Claim 29 recites a computer system supporting access to a network. The computer system includes a processor, a memory unit that stores instructions associated with an application executed by the processor, a communication interface that supports communication with nodes in the network, and an interconnect coupling the processor, the memory unit, and the communication interface. The interconnect enables the computer system to execute the application and perform operations of (a) providing the host computer access to the network through a network interface, (b) forwarding a network message transmitted to the host computer from a node in the network through the network interface, the network message including a command to initiate reconfiguration of the host computer for further communications through the network interface, (c) after forwarding the network message to the host computer, monitoring communications transmitted from the host computer through the network interface to identify whether the host computer initiates reconfiguration of the

host computer based on execution of the network message, and (d) in response to detecting that the host computer does not initiate reconfiguration of the host computer based on receipt of the network message, disabling the network interface utilized by the host computer to access the network.

The cited reference does not teach a method including in response to detecting that the host computer does not initiate reconfiguration of the host computer based on receipt of the network message, *disabling the network interface utilized by the host computer to access the network*. Rather, Radia discloses a method for modifying a routing table of a router within a computer network based on DHCP-assigned addresses as determined by examining DHCPACK packets. There is no indication that Radia performs any *disabling of the network interface utilized by the host computer to access the network*. The Office Action, on page 4, cites col. 5, lines 44-54 of Radia as teaching this feature. However, the cited portion does not teach the feature. Rather, the cited portion teaches that router 106 (by executing router process 214) updates its route table 216 to indicate that packets directed at the IP address extracted from the DHCPACK message (in step 406) should thenceforth be directed towards client system 102. This has nothing to do with *disabling the network interface utilized by the host computer to access the network*. If the rejection of claim 29 is to be maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that it be pointed out with particularity where the cited prior art teaches in response to detecting that the host computer does not initiate reconfiguration of the host computer based on receipt of the network message, *disabling the network interface utilized by the host computer to access the network*.

For the reasons stated above, claim 29 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 29 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 29 is in allowable condition.

Because claims 30, 32-35, and 41 depend from and further limit claim 29, claims 30, 32-35, and 41 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons.

Additionally, it should be understood that the dependent claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

For example, claim 34 recites a method as in claim 29, further including, *inter alia*, *detecting that the network message is a DHCPFORCERENEW (Dynamic Host Control Protocol Force Renew) message transmitted from the configuration server to the host computer*. This feature is not taught or suggested by the cited prior art. The Office Action, on page 5, cites col. 5, lines 8-13 and 28037 of Radia as teaching this feature. However, Applicant was unable to determine how the cited portions describe this feature. If the rejection of claim 34 is to be maintained, Applicant respectfully requests that it be pointed out with particularity where the cited prior art teaches *detecting that the network message is a DHCPFORCERENEW message transmitted from the configuration server to the host computer*.

Claims 11-12 and 14-17

Claim 11 recites a method for configuring a host computer to access a network. The claim recites limitations similar to those limitations found in claim 29. Accordingly, claim 11 distinguishes over the prior art for reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 29.

For the reasons stated above, claim 11 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 11 is in allowable condition.

Because claims 12, 14-17, and 39 depend from and further limit claim 11, claims 12, 14-17, and 39 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons. Additionally, it should be understood that the dependent claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

Claims 1-4 and 6-10

Claim 1 recites a method for reconfiguring a host computer. The method includes (a) enabling the host computer to access a network through a network interface, (b) intercepting a network message i) received from over the network and ii) destined for receipt by the host computer through the network interface, and (c) in response to intercepting the network message, disabling the network interface to prompt the host computer to perform a reconfiguration routine.

The cited references do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, a method for reconfiguring a host computer including (c) in response to intercepting the network message, *disabling the network interface* to prompt the host computer to perform a reconfiguration routine. Rather, as mentioned above in connection with claim 29, the cited portion of Radia does not teach *disabling the network interface*, but actually teaches that router 106 (by executing router process 214) updates its route table 216 to indicate that packets directed at the IP address extracted from the DHCPACK message (in step 406) should thenceforth be directed towards client system 102. Accordingly, claim 1 distinguishes over the prior art for reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claim 29.

In addition, the cited references do not teach or suggest, either alone or in combination, a method for reconfiguring a host computer including (b) *intercepting* a network message i) received from over the network and ii) destined for receipt by the host computer through the network interface. The Office Action, on page 6, cites Radia at col. 5, lines 28-37 as teaching this feature. However, the cited portion merely teaches that router 106 receives DHCP message 300 and examines it. Merriam-Webster's Dictionary defines "intercept" in its common usage to mean "to stop, seize, or interrupt in progress or course or before arrival." There is no indication in Radia that the DHCP message 300 is stopped, seized, or interrupted. Indeed, to the contrary, Radia

teaches that the DHCP message 300 is forwarded to the client system 102 regardless of whether it includes a DHCPACK message (col. 6, lines 7-11).

For the reasons stated above, claim 1 patentably distinguishes over the cited prior art, and the rejection of claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claim 1 is in allowable condition.

Because claims 2-4, 6-10 and 38 depend from and further limit claim 1, claims 2-4, 6-10 and 38 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons. Additionally, it should be understood that the dependent claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

Claims 19-22, 24-28, and 36-37

Claim 19 recites a computer system supporting access to a network. The claim recites limitations similar to those limitations found in claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, claim 19 distinguishes over the prior art for reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claims 1 and 29.

Claim 36 recites a computer system coupled to a network that supports transmission of data. The claim recites limitations similar to those limitations found in claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, claim 36 distinguishes over the prior art for reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claims 1 and 29.

Claim 37 recites a computer program product including a computer-readable medium having instructions stored thereon for processing data information, such that the instructions, when carried out by a processing device, enable the processing device to perform various steps. The claim recites limitations similar to those limitations found in claims 1 and 29. Accordingly, claim 37 distinguishes over the prior art for reasons similar to those presented above in connection with claims 1 and 29.

For the reasons stated above, claims 19, 36, and 37 patentably distinguish over the cited prior art, and the rejections of claims 19, 36, and 37 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) should be withdrawn. Accordingly, claims 19, 36, and 37 are in allowable condition.

Because claims 20-22, 24-28, and 40 depend from and further limit claim 19, claims 20-22, 24-28, and 40 are in allowable condition for at least the same reasons as claim 19. Additionally, it should be understood that the dependent claims recite additional features which further patentably distinguish over the cited prior art.

Newly Added Claims

Claims 38-41 have been added and are believed to be in allowable condition. Claim 38 depends from claim 8. Claim 39 depends from claim 11. Claim 40 depends from claim 25. Claim 41 depends from claim 29. Support for claims 38-41 is provided within the Specification, for example, on page 13, line 23 through page 14, line 17. No new matter has been added.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing remarks, this Application should be in condition for allowance. A Notice to this affect is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes, after this Amendment, that the Application is not in condition for allowance, the Examiner is respectfully requested to call the Applicant's Representative at the number below.

Applicant hereby petitions for any extension of time which is required to maintain the pendency of this case. If there is a fee occasioned by this Amendment, including an extension fee, please charge any deficiency to Deposit Account No. 50-3661.

-21-

If the enclosed papers or fees are considered incomplete, the Patent Office is respectfully requested to contact the undersigned collect at (508) 616-2900, in Westborough, Massachusetts.

Respectfully submitted,

/Michael Ari Behar/

M. Ari Behar, Esq.
Attorney for Applicant
Registration No.: 58,203
Bainwood, Huang & Associates, L.L.C.
Highpoint Center
2 Connector Road
Westborough, Massachusetts 01581
Telephone: (508) 616-2900
Facsimile: (508) 366-4688

Attorney Docket No.: 1004-066.001

Dated: April 8, 2008